

## REMARKS

The Office Action of May 1, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. By this amendment claims 9, 27, 29 and 33-37 have been amended and claims 43-44 have been added.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

*Claims 1, 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Dascalu, U.S. Patent No. 6,754,713 ("Dascalu").* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Dascalu discloses a session wall device which is connected to a local area network for passively listening to communications sent over the network and for terminating communications sessions between devices if it detects an event which is not permitted. As illustrated in Figure 1 of Dascalu, the session wall device is connected to a network 1 via a network adaptor 2. The session wall device includes a protocol scanner 16 which scans data in a received data buffer 6 and compares it with access rules 10 to determine whether a message between devices is permitted or not. The access rules 10 are a table of groups of servers, groups of clients and rules between them. The rules define actions which should take place when a specific set of protocols is used when two or more parties communicate. When the protocol scanner 16 detects an event which is not permitted by the access rules 10, the protocol scanner 16 generates a message which terminates the communication session in which that event took place.

Independent claims 9 and 27 include the claimed features of "an authentication component configured to authenticate a communicating device" or "an access control component . . . arranged to arbitrate whether access of the communicating device to the first application is granted or refused wherein if the arbitration requires an authentication of the communicating device, the access control component configure to instruct the authentication component to authenticate the communicating device." Dascalu does not disclose these claimed features.

For instance, Dascalu does not disclose that the protocol scanner 16 instructs an authentication component to authenticate a communicating device in order to determine whether a message is permitted or not. Dascalu merely discloses that if the protocol scanner 16 detects an

event/message between devices which is not permitted, that the communication session is terminated. Therefore, for at least these reasons independent claims 9 and 27 are allowable over Dascalu.

Furthermore, it would not be obvious to adapt the teaching of Dascalu to fall within the scope of Claims 9 and 27 because Dascalu is concerned with determining whether a communication session should be terminated on the basis of whether a message is permitted or not. The determination is based on the nature of the message and is not concerned with determining whether the devices in the communication session are authentic. Dascalu does not disclose any authentication process and one may only assume that such a process is performed prior to the communication session being initiated (since the protocol scanner 16 appears to assume that it correctly knows which devices are communicating in the session and accesses the access rules 10 accordingly using that information). Therefore, for at least these additional reasons independent claims 9 and 27 are allowable over the cited documents. Moreover, dependent claims 33-37 which ultimately depend from independent claim 9 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 9.

Independent claim 29 includes the claimed feature of “if the determination requires an authentication of the requesting device, the authentication is performed during that determination and not previously, wherein the determination is made on the basis of the identity of the application requested.” As discussed above Dascalu does not disclose any authentication process and one may only assume that such a process is performed prior to the communication session being initiated (since the protocol scanner 16 appears to assume that it correctly knows which devices are communicating in the session and accesses the access rules 10 accordingly using that information). Therefore, for at least this reason independent claim 29 is allowable over Dascalu.

By this amendment, independent claim 43 has been added to the application. Similar to independent claim 29, independent claim 43 includes the claimed feature of “if the determination requires an authentication of the requesting device, the authentication is performed during that determination and not previously, wherein the determination is made on the basis of the identity of the application requested.” Therefore for at least the same reasons as discussed above with independent claims 29, newly added independent claim 43 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent claim 44 which depends from independent claim 43 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 43.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and a finding of their allowability. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 10, 2008

By: /Kenneth F. Smolik/  
Kenneth F. Smolik  
Registration No. 44,344  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Phone: 312-463-5000  
Fax: 312-463-5001